

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ex rel.  
MARY PATZER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action, File No. 11-CV-560

SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT CORPORATION,  
SIKORSKY SUPPORT SERVICES, INC., and  
DERCO AEROSPACE, INC.,

Defendants.

---

UNOPPOSED MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE CASES

---

The parties, by their undersigned counsel, hereby jointly move pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 42(a) to consolidate for purposes of pretrial practice and trial this matter with the civil action titled *United States ex rel. Cimma v. Sikorsky Support Services, Inc. et al.*, No. 14-cv-1381.

Rule 42(a) permits consolidation of actions pending before the Court that “involve a common question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 42(a). The Court should consolidate cases sharing a common question of law or fact when doing so will further the interests of judicial economy, avoidance of delay, and avoidance of inconsistent or conflicting results. *Habitat Ed. Ctr., Inc. v. Kimbell*, 250 F.R.D. 390, 394 (E.D. Wis. 2008).

Here, the *Patzer* and *Cimma* cases share several common questions of law and fact. Defendant Sikorsky Support Services, Inc. (“SSSI”) was awarded two successive contracts by the Navy to maintain its T-34, T-44, and T-6 training aircraft. SSSI, in turn, engaged an affiliated company, Defendant Derco Aerospace, Inc. (“Derco”), to procure and manage the parts and materials necessary to maintain the aircraft in the performance of both prime contracts. In

the *Patzer* case, the government alleges that in the performance of the first of SSSI's prime contracts: (1) SSSI and Derco agreed to an illegal cost-plus-percentage-of-cost subcontract for the parts and materials that resulted in excessive and improper billings to the government; and (2) that SSSI and Derco agreed that Derco would provide improper kickbacks to SSSI. In the *Cimma* case, the government raises these same two allegations with respect to the performance of the second of SSSI's prime contracts. Although the specifics of the government's claims in the two cases differ in some respects, the cases share several basic common questions of law and fact, including whether the defendants violated the statutory prohibition on cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost subcontracting and whether they agreed to an improper kickback arrangement.

Consolidation of the two cases for purposes of pretrial practice and trial will also further the interests of the Court and the parties. Many of the documents and witnesses in the two cases overlap, and, accordingly, consolidation will facilitate discovery and avoid redundancy. Motion practice should also be streamlined by consolidating the cases because the parties raise many of the same claims and defenses in both matters. A joint trial will also conserve the resources of the Court, the parties, and the witnesses, while also avoiding the potential for inconsistent results.

Finally, the parties anticipate that they will file a joint proposal for a case management plan for the two matters if the Court grants their motion to consolidate them.

Counsel certifies that no separate memorandum will be filed.

Respectfully submitted this 1st day of November, 2017.

COUNSEL FOR THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CHAD READLER  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

GREGORY J. HANSTAAD  
United States Attorney  
Eastern District of Wisconsin

By: s/Michael A. Carter  
MICHAEL A. CARTER  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Eastern District of Wisconsin  
State Bar No. 1090041  
[Michael.A.Carter@usdoj.gov](mailto:Michael.A.Carter@usdoj.gov)

LISA T. WARWICK  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Eastern District of Wisconsin  
State Bar No. 1017754  
517 E. Wisconsin Ave.  
Milwaukee, WI 53202  
(414) 297-1700  
Fax: (414) 297-4394  
[lisa.warwick@usdoj.gov](mailto:lisa.warwick@usdoj.gov)

MICHAEL D. GRANSTON  
MICHAEL TINGLE  
ALAN S. GALE  
GARY NEWKIRK  
Attorneys, Civil Division  
United States Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 261  
Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, DC 20044  
(202) 307-6296  
Fax: (202) 616-3085  
[alan.gale@usdoj.gov](mailto:alan.gale@usdoj.gov)  
[gary.newkirk@usdoj.gov](mailto:gary.newkirk@usdoj.gov)

COUNSEL FOR RELATOR MARY PATZER:

**Cross Law Firm, S.C.**  
Attorneys for Mary Patzer

By: s/Nola. J. Hitchcock Cross  
NOLA J. HITCHCOCK CROSS  
Wisconsin Bar Number: 1015817

MARY C. FLANNER  
Wisconsin Bar Number: 1013095  
Lawyer's Building  
845 North 11<sup>th</sup> Street  
Milwaukee, WI 53233  
Phone: (414) 224-0000  
Fax: (414) 273-7055

**Moyé Law Firm**  
Attorneys for Mary Patzer

DAVID W. MOYÉ  
Florida Bar Number 0782350

527 E. Park Ave.  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Phone: (850) 224-6693  
Fax: (850) 222-6693  
david@moyelawfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANTS:

**Dinsmore & Shohl LLP**  
Trial Counsel for Defendants

By: s/Michael J. Bronson  
Michael J. Bronson  
Ohio Bar No. 0074448  
Patrick M. Hagan  
Ohio Bar No. 0079927  
Joseph W. Harper  
Ohio Bar No. 0079902  
Laurie A. Witek  
Ohio Bar No. 0083955

255 East Fifth Street, Suite 1900  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
[michael.bronson@dinsmore.com](mailto:michael.bronson@dinsmore.com)  
[patrick.hagan@dinsmore.com](mailto:patrick.hagan@dinsmore.com)  
[joe.harper@dinsmore.com](mailto:joe.harper@dinsmore.com)  
[laurie.witek@dinsmore.com](mailto:laurie.witek@dinsmore.com)  
Office: (513) 977-8200  
Fax: (513) 977-8141

**Biskupic & Jacobs, S.C.**  
Counsel for Defendants

STEVEN M. BISKUPIC  
Wisconsin Bar No. 1018217  
1045 West Glen Oaks Lane, Suite 106  
Mequon, WI 53902  
[skiskupic@biskupicjacobs.com](mailto:skiskupic@biskupicjacobs.com)  
Office: (262) 241-3300  
Fax: (866) 700-7640